

**Docket No. : AUR 0014 PA/40069.19**

**Serial No. : 09/409,566**

**Remarks**

The Applicants' representative wishes to thank the Examiner for his time during the telephone interview, which was conducted February 15, 2006. As a result of that interview, claims 24, 44, 48, 66 and 67 are amended, and claims 69-71 are new. Support for the added limitations in claims 24, 44, 48, 66 and 67 and new claims 69-71 is provided for in the specification at page 5, lines 5-14, page 6, lines 10-22, page 13, lines 10-14, and by FIGS. 4, 5C, and 15-17. No new matter has been entered. Accordingly, claims 24-71 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 24-68 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falk Funeral Homes publication by Denise Reaman (The Morning Call). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the telephone interview, the Falk publication neither discloses nor suggests, *inter alia*, the limitation of "automatically customizing sequence of information and further choices presented by said processes on the computer to guide the user in electronically planning the funeral ceremony based on selection of said choices by the user on said selection guide" as required by amended independent 24, 48, 66, and 67. Applicants assert that although not need to define the present invention over the cited art, amending the claims with the limitation "by the user" further stresses the interactivity of the recited processes with the user. Furthermore, claim 24 has been amended to recite the limitation "automatically filtering available products and services to those meeting an interest of the user based on previously selected choices of the user." Such limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the cited art individually or in combination.

As clearly evidenced by the historical webpages of the website [www.grief.com](http://www.grief.com) to which the Falk publication refers, downloaded from the Internet Archive: WayBackMachine (<http://www.archive.org/web/web.php>) and copies provided to the Examiner for the interview and which are herein incorporated by reference, we note that the website only provides a list of static web pages that does not guide a user through the funeral making process. As also with the website [www.PLAN4ever.com](http://www.PLAN4ever.com) that is referenced in the cited "Move the Mouse" and Hogan

**Docket No. : AUR 0014 PA/40069.19**

**Serial No. : 09/409,566**

articles, and which was previously addressed by the Applicants in their March 19, 2002 and August 5, 2002 Responses, the website grief.com does not employ on a computer a funeral planning routine comprising processes configuring the computer to automatically guide the user in electronically planning the funeral ceremony as required by the claims. The website grief.com also does not automatically customizing sequence of information and further choices presented by said processes on the computer to guide the user in electronically planning the funeral ceremony based on selection of said choices by the user on said selection guide as required by the claim 24.

Further support of the patentability of the present invention is provided by the cited Korky Vann article, which provides further evidence of the state of the art prior to the present invention ("The computer-savvy Carrolls decided to check all available funeral planning software....What they found surprised them.... "There wasn't any at all..."). Applicants have continually stated such a position of the prior art before the present invention.

The Korky Vann article, although mentioning that their software walks users step-by-step through such topics as: interment, burial, cremation, etc., fails to disclose or suggest the limitation of "automatically customizing sequence of information and further choices presented by said processes on the computer to guide the user in electronically planning the funeral ceremony based on selection of said choices by the user on said selection guide" provided in amended independent 24, 48, 66, and 67. Furthermore, the Korky Vann article does not disclose or suggest the limitation "automatically filtering available products and services to those meeting an interest of the user based on previously selected choices of the user" as also required by claim 24. Accordingly, Applicants believe that Examiner errs in his belief that the present invention is unpatentable in view of the cited art.

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the above amendments and remarks the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve efficiently any formal matters or to discuss any aspects of the application or of this response. Otherwise, early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully solicited.

Docket No. : AUR 0014 PA/40069.19  
Serial No. : 09/409,566

Respectfully submitted,  
DINSMORE & SHOHL, L.L.P.

By



William A. Jividen

Registration No. 42,695

One Dayton Centre  
One South Main Street, Suite 1300  
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023  
Telephone: (937) 449-6448  
WAJ/